

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. No art rejections were presented.

Please cancel Claims 8-10 without prejudice. Please amend Claims 1-7 as set forth herein. Please add new Claims 11-13. No new matter has been added.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 6 under §112, first paragraph, the Examiner states that the claims fail to comply with the enablement requirement.

Specifically, the Examiner seems to imply that the specification does not enable “calculating product distances between all STTC codes having a length equal to the minimum effective length, wherein for each of pairs of all initial states and all end states for each of the STTC codes, initial states are identical to end states”. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to address this issue.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 6 under §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 6 under §112, second paragraph, the Examiner states that the claims are indefinite.

First, the Examiner states that it is unclear whether “the STTC codes” recited in lines 10 and 12 of Claim 1 and lines 8 and 10 of Claim 6 refers to all STTC codes or the STTC codes having a length equal to the minimum effective length. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to address this issue.

Second, the Examiner states that Claim 6 is missing information in line 13. Claim 6 has been amended to address this issue.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of independent Claims 1 and 6 under §112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-7 and 11-13, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd. Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/MJM/dr